



SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT		AT	TORNEY DOCKET NO	
08/684,40	5 06/17/96	s FUMA		FH	<u> </u>	
— ALFRED M WALKER 742 VETERANS MEMORIAL		F3M1/0310	7		EXAMINER GRAHAM, M	
HAUPPAUGE		. HIGHWHY	-	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
_				DATE MAILED:	03/10/98	

Please find below a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application.

Commissioner of Patents



, Office Action Summary

Application No. 08/664,406 Applicant(s)

Puma et al.

Examiner

Mark S. Graham

Group Art Unit 3304



X Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jun 18, 1997	·					
☐ This action is FINAL .						
☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935	•					
A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extension 37 CFR 1.136(a).	respond within the period for response will cause the					
Disposition of Claims						
X Claim(s) 22-25	is/are pending in the application.					
Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
Claim(s)	is/are allowed.					
X Claim(s) 22-25						
Claim(s)						
☐ Claims						
Application Papers						
See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing	Review, PTO-948.					
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objecte	d to by the Examiner.					
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on	is 🗆 approved 🗆 disapproved.					
\square The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority u	nder 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d).					
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been						
received.						
received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Numl						
\square received in this national stage application from the Ir	nternational Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).					
*Certified copies not received:						
Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).					
Attachment(s)						
☑ Notice of References Cited, PTO-892						
☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s)					
☐ Interview Summary, PTO-413☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948						
☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152	•					
SEE OFFICE ACTION ON TH	IE FOLLOWING PAGES					

Serial Number: 08/664,406

Art Unit: 3304

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 22-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The originally filed disclosure lacks antecedent basis for the amendments to the specification and drawings filed 6/18/97. The amendment introduces new matter into the application.

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321© may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 22-25 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting over claims 1-20 of U. S. Patent No. 5,527,033 since the claims, if allowed, would improperly extend the "right to exclude" already granted in the patent.

Serial Number: 08/664,406

Art Unit: 3304

Page 3

The subject matter claimed in the instant application is fully disclosed in the patent and is covered by the patent since the patent and the application are claiming common subject matter, as follows: A hockey game box score converting device.

Furthermore, there is no apparent reason why applicant was prevented from presenting claims corresponding to those of the instant application during prosecution of the application which matured into a patent. See *In re Schneller*, 397 F.2d 350, 158 USPQ 210 (CCPA 1968). See also MPEP § 804.

This application repeats a substantial portion of prior Application No., filed, and adds and claims additional disclosure not presented in the prior application. Since this application names an inventor or inventors named in the prior application, it may constitute a continuation-in-part of the prior application. Should applicant desire to obtain the benefit of the filing date of the prior application, attention is directed to 35 U.S.C. 120 and 37 CFR 1.78.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark S. Graham at telephone number (703) 308-1355.

MSG February 27, 1998 MARKS GRAHAM MARKS EXAMINER PRIMARY EXAMINER